

JUN 05 2006

PATENT

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being faxed to 571-273-8300 on the date shown below to Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: 6-5-06
Himanshu S. Amin**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Eric J. Horvitz, *et al.*

Examiner: Harun M. Yimam

Serial No: 09/825,820

Art Unit: 2611

Filing Date: April 4, 2001

Title: TIME-CENTRIC TRAINING, INFERENCE AND USER INTERFACE FOR
PERSONALIZED MEDIA PROGRAM GUIDES

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Appellants' representative submits this brief in connection with an appeal of the above-identified patent application. A credit card payment form is filed concurrently herewith in connection with all fees due regarding this appeal brief. In the event any additional fees may be due and/or are not covered by the credit card, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP161US].

06/06/2006 TL0111 00000007 09825820

01 FC:1402

500.00 0P

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

I. Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(i))

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Microsoft Corporation, the assignee of the present application.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(ii))

Appellants, appellants' legal representative, and/or the assignee of the present application are not aware of any appeals or interferences which may be related to, will directly affect, or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. Status of Claims (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(iii))

Claims 8, 19-31, and 35-52 have been cancelled and no claims have been withdrawn. Claims 1-7, 9-18, and 32-34 stand rejected by the Examiner. The rejection of claims 1-7, 9-18, and 32-34 is being appealed.

IV. Status of Amendments (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(iv))

No amendments have been entered subsequent the Final Office Action dated August 25, 2005.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(v))**Independent Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites a system for ranking items in a selectable information list received from an information delivery system, comprising: a database system that logs selections of information viewed by a user of the information delivery system and logs temporal history related to a plurality of time subintervals that correspond to the viewing of the selected information; and a collaborative filtering system that employs the logged temporal history and disparate logged temporal history from a plurality of disparate database systems to generate a recommendation specific to the user based at least in part on information obtained from a plurality of users related to a particular one

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

of the plurality of time subintervals. (*See e.g.*, pg. 2, ln. 28 – pg. 3, ln. 18; pg. 7, ln. 15 – pg. 17, ln. 7; *see generally* Figs. 1-4).

Independent Claim 18

Independent claim 18 recites a multimedia system that ranks programs in an electronic program guide list received from a program delivery system, comprising; a database system that logs selections of programs viewed by a user utilizing a program delivery system and logs temporal history that includes a plurality of time subintervals that correspond to the viewing of the selected programs; and a collaborative filtering system that employs the logged temporal history from the database system and different logged temporal history from a plurality of database systems associated with disparate users to produce a user specific recommendation based at least in part on information associated with a plurality of users related to a particular one of the plurality of time subintervals. (*See e.g.*, pg. 2, ln. 28 – pg. 3, ln. 18; pg. 7, ln. 15 – pg. 17, ln. 7; *see generally* Figs. 1-4).

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(vi))

A. Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-18, and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Maissel *et al.* (U.S. 6,637,029).

B. Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel *et al.* (U.S. 6,637,029) and Ferman *et al.* (U.S. 2002/0059584).

C. Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel *et al.* (US 6,637,029) and Hopple *et al.* (US 6,519,769).

VII. Argument (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(vii))

A. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-18, and 32-34 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-18, and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Maissel *et al.* (U.S. 6,637,029). It is respectfully submitted that this

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

rejection should be reversed for at least the following reasons. Maissel *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “*each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added).

The subject claims relate to integrating considerations of temporality with collaborative filtering. In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 18) recites a database system that logs selections of information viewed by a user of the information delivery system and *logs temporal history related to a plurality of time subintervals* that correspond to the viewing of the selected information. Independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 18) further recites a collaborative filtering system that employs the *logged temporal history* and *disparate logged temporal history* from a plurality of disparate database systems to generate a *recommendation specific to the user* based at least in part on *information obtained from a plurality of users* related to a particular one of the plurality of *time subintervals*. Maissel *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest such claimed aspects.

More particularly, Maissel *et al.* fails to anticipate or suggest that a collaborative filtering system generates a *recommendation specific to the user* based at least in part on information obtained from a plurality of users as claimed. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner contends that such aspects are disclosed by Maissel *et al.* at column 19, lines 27-38, 105 in Figure 1, and column 12, lines 23-38. (See Advisory Action dated October 18, 2005). Appellants’ representative respectfully disagrees with such contentions. In particular, Maissel *et al.* notes that real-time information regarding a proportion or percentage of the audience viewing a particular program may be computed, transmitted to subscribers, and displayed. (See col. 19, ll. 20-30). An alert can inform a user that a program on another channel is currently being viewed by a large portion of the audience. (See col. 19, ll. 31-37). However, these displays are not recommendations *specific to the*

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

user. Rather, the displayed proportions, graphs, and alerts related to percentages of users watching particular programs are *similar for all users*. Maissel *et al.* notes that the alerts related to a large portion of the audience can be similar to the alert 105 from Fig. 1, which can be based on viewing behavior. (See col. 19, ll. 31-33; Fig. 1). However, Maissel *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest that the information associated with these distinct types of alerts are combined. Thus, the Examiner improperly concludes that “every alert that makes a recommendation to the user is based on particular viewed behavior” and therefore “the generated recommendation is specific to the user.” (See Advisory Action dated October 18, 2005). Instead, Maissel *et al.* notes that alerts based on viewing behavior can be provided to a user and alerts based on the general audience behavior can be provided to the user – however, Maissel *et al.* does not generate a *recommendation specific to the user* based at least in part on information obtained from a plurality of users. Accordingly, Maissel *et al.* fails to anticipate or suggest such claimed aspects.

In addition, the Examiner is reminded that the standard by which anticipation is to be measured is *strict identity* between the cited document and the invention as claimed, not mere equivalence or similarity. See, *Richardson* at 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920. This means that in order to establish anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102, the single document cited must not only expressly or inherently describe each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim, but also the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. The fact that Maissel *et al.* fails to provide a recommendation specific to the user based at least in part on information obtained from a plurality of users, but rather discloses providing alerts based on viewing behavior alone and alerts based on general audience behavior alone, leads one to believe that the cited document in the final analysis does not provide an invention identical to that recited in the subject claims.

Additionally, Maissel *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest employ[ing] the *logged temporal history* and *disparate logged temporal history* from a plurality of disparate collaborative filtering systems to make a recommendation specific to the user as recited in the subject claims. Thus, temporal history associated with a user as well as temporal histories associated with disparate users are employed to make a user specific

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

recommendation. The Advisory Action contends that Maissel *et al.* discloses such aspects at column 12, lines 23-43 and notes that “the viewer preference profile comprises program characteristics of preferred programs viewed by a viewer at various time (disparate logged temporal history).” (See Advisory Action dated October 18, 2005). Appellants’ representative avers to the contrary. Maissel *et al.* notes that the viewer preference profile can include information, obtained over a period of time, related to the various current program characteristics of programs viewed by a viewer at various times. (See col. 12, ll. 26-30). Thus, Maissel *et al.* relates to employing viewing history associated with a particular user. However, Maissel *et al.* is silent regarding utilizing disparate logged temporal history from a plurality of disparate collaborative filtering systems. As noted above, Maissel *et al.* describes displaying real-time audience viewing information. However, this information is not utilized to provide a user specific recommendation. Additionally, the real-time audience viewing information is not a logged temporal history; on the contrary, the real-time information is associated with currently viewed programs. (See col. 19, ll. 31-37). Maissel *et al.* further discloses that rating information, which can include information on general viewer popularity of a program based on ratings, can be used to modify a customization of a program guide. (See col. 14, ll. 38-46). However, Maissel *et al.* is silent regarding the rating information being from a plurality of disparate collaborative filtering systems as claimed. The Advisory Action incorrectly cites Maissel *et al.* at column 14, lines 38-46 to support the assertion that the rating information is from a plurality of disparate collaborative filtering systems. (See Advisory Action dated October 18, 2005). While Maissel *et al.* may note that rating information can be a factor used by the intelligent agent, there is no teaching or suggestion in connection with the rating information being from a plurality of disparate collaborative filtering systems. Therefore, Maissel *et al.* fails to anticipate or suggest such claimed aspects.

Moreover, Maissel *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest a database system that ... logs temporal history *related to a plurality of time subintervals* that correspond to the viewing of the selected information. It is asserted in the Advisory Action that such aspects are disclosed by Maissel *et al.* at column 12, lines 26-28 and 40-45. (See Advisory Action dated October 18, 2005). Appellants’ representative avers to the

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

contrary. In particular, Maissel *et al.* discloses that information can be obtained over a period of time, and the period of time can be a few minutes, a year, or longer. (*See* col. 12, ll. 26-31). Maissel *et al.* additionally notes that an unlimited amount of time can be used to collect information. (*See* col. 12, ll. 41-43). Also, Maissel *et al.* discloses that old information can be eliminated from a profile or a profile may be reset. (*See* col. 12, ll. 41-45). Thus, Maissel *et al.* does not disclose logging temporal history related to a **plurality of time subintervals**; instead, Maissel *et al.* relates to obtaining information over an interval of time and discarding information from other time intervals. Accordingly, Maissel *et al.* fails to anticipate or suggest such claimed aspects.

Furthermore, Maissel *et al.* fails to anticipate or suggest that the user specific recommendation is generated **based on information ... related to a particular one of the plurality of time subintervals** as recited in the subject claims. The Advisory Action contends that "Maissel discloses that the viewer preference profile can include information obtained over a period of time on the various program characteristics of programs viewed by a viewer at various times (plurality of time subintervals) and that any length of time can be used (column 12, lines 23-34). Maissel explicitly discloses that the period of time may be as short as a few minutes or as long as a year or more." (*See* Advisory Action dated October 18, 2005). Appellants' representative disagrees with these contentions. As noted above, Maissel *et al.* relates to obtaining information over an interval of time that can be a minute or a year in length. Additionally, Maissel *et al.* discloses discarding information from other time intervals. Maissel *et al.*, however, is silent with regards to utilizing information from one time subinterval out of a time interval (*e.g.*, plurality of time subintervals), where the temporal history related to additional time subintervals is also logged (and not discarded). Thus, Maissel *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest such claimed aspects.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Maissel *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest the subject invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 18 (and claims 2, 4, 9-17, and 32-34 which respectively depend there from). This rejection should be reversed.

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

B. Rejection of Claims 3 and 5 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel *et al.* (U.S. 6,637,029) and Ferman *et al.* (U.S. 2002/0059584). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be reversed for the following reasons. Maissel *et al.* and Ferman *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Ferman *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maissel *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1 (which claims 3 and 5 depend from). Therefore, the subject invention as recited in claims 3 and 5 is not obvious over the combination of Maissel *et al.* and Ferman *et al.* Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be reversed.

C. Rejection of Claims 6 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel *et al.* (US 6,637,029) and Hopple *et al.* (US 6,519,769). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be reversed for the following reasons. Maissel *et al.* and Hopple *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Hopple *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maissel *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1 (which claims 6 and 7 depend from). Therefore, the subject invention as recited in claims 6 and 7 is not obvious over the combination of Maissel *et al.* and Hopple *et al.* Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be reversed.

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

D. Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-7, 9-18, and 32-34 be reversed.

If any additional fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24th Floor, National City Center
1900 East 9th Street
Telephone: (216) 696-8730
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

VIII. Claims Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1. A system for ranking items in a selectable information list received from an information delivery system, comprising:
 - a database system that logs selections of information viewed by a user of the information delivery system and logs temporal history related to a plurality of time subintervals that correspond to the viewing of the selected information; and
 - a collaborative filtering system that employs the logged temporal history and disparate logged temporal history from a plurality of disparate database systems to generate a recommendation specific to the user based at least in part on information obtained from a plurality of users related to a particular one of the plurality of time subintervals.
2. The system of claim 1, a selection is logged if the selection is viewed for a dwell time that exceeds a predetermined threshold.
3. The system of claim 2, the collaborative filtering system assigns a positive vote to logged selections that are viewed for a dwell time that exceeds a predetermined threshold.
4. The system of claim 1, a selection is logged if the selection is briefly viewed and jumped away to another selection.
5. The system of claim 4, the collaborative filtering system assigns a negative vote to logged selections that are viewed briefly and jumped away to another selection.
6. The system of claim 1, the viewed information is time stamped by event type and the collaborative filtering system is based on a single collaborative filtering model that is trained according to time intervals that the information has been viewed.

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

7. The system of claim 1, the collaborative filtering system is based on a plurality of separate collaborative filtering models, each collaborative filtering model is trained with the information from a particular time interval of temporal history that has been viewed.

8. (Cancelled).

9. The system of claim 1, the collaborative filtering system provides in real-time a selectable recommendation list ordered by estimated degree of preference that a user has for each item.

10. The system of claim 9, the collaborative filtering system receives attributes of at least one user of the system and utilizes these attributes in providing the selectable recommendation list.

11. The system of claim 10, the collaborative filtering system receives attributes of other systems and utilizes these attributes in providing a globally ranked recommendation list to a cluster of systems based on the temporal viewing history of the systems of the cluster.

12. The system of claim 9, the collaborative filtering system receives a previously viewed item list that has been filtered by a filtering system and generates a new recommendation according to the preferences provided by the filtered previously viewed item list.

13. The system of claim 12, the filtering system comprising at least one of a live show selection filter, a time period filter and a popularity filter, a pattern search engine and an adding items of interest and update component.

14. The system of claim 1, further comprising a user interface that allows a user to provide at least one filter to a reviewed items list.

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

15. The system of claim 14, the user interface allows a user to request a time period for reviewing information from the selectable recommendation list wherein the collaborative filtering system supplies the selections for the time period requested based on the temporal history of selections within a similar time interval covering the time period.

16. The system of claim 14, the user interface receives a reviewed items list, allows a user to modify the reviewed items list, and inputs the modified reviewed items list as updated preferences into the collaborative filtering system, such that a new recommendation list can be generated based on the updated preferences.

17. The system of claim 1, the information being multimedia.

18. A multimedia system that ranks programs in an electronic program guide list received from a program delivery system, comprising;

a database system that logs selections of programs viewed by a user utilizing a program delivery system and logs temporal history that includes a plurality of time subintervals that correspond to the viewing of the selected programs; and

a collaborative filtering system that employs the logged temporal history from the database system and different logged temporal history from a plurality of database systems associated with disparate users to produce a user specific recommendation based at least in part on information associated with a plurality of users related to a particular one of the plurality of time subintervals.

19-31. (Cancelled).

32. The system of claim 18, the multimedia system residing on a remote server coupled to at least one set top box wherein recommendations are generated by the server and transmitted to the set top box.

09/825,820

MS150904.01/MSFTP161US

33. The system of claim 32, the set top box having an electronic program guide system that receives and displays the recommendations to a user.

34. The system of claim 32, the remote server further comprising a global inference system that groups multimedia systems into clusters and a set of general recommendations for members of at least one cluster based on the temporal viewing habits of members of the cluster.

35-52. (Cancelled).

IX. Evidence Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(ix))

None.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(x))

None.